

REVISED PROPOSAL FOR DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *PHASIA* LATREILLE. Z.N.(S.) 1706

(see volume 22, pages 243-245, volume 23, pages 9-11, 134-144, 196-197)

By Benno Herting (Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, European Station, Delémont, Switzerland)

Dr. Dupuis has made a very elaborate study of the *Phasia* problem (see volume 23, pages 134-144) and has drawn attention to some important points which have not yet been taken into account.

2. The identity of *Thereva subcoleoprata* Fabricius, which is the nominal type-species of *Phasia*, remains after all the decisive problem. Dupuis, like Sabrosky, does not consider the material seen by Meigen in Fabricius' collection as typical of *T. subcoleoprata* Fabricius. His arguments (p. 138, chapter II A 2) are those already brought forward by Sabrosky: (1) the relevant material should be in the Bosc collection, and (2) Meigen and Fallén gave under the true *subcoleoprata* Linné also the bibliographic references to Fabricius. I have already commented these arguments which I consider as invalid, in my reply to Dr. Sabrosky (see volume 23, page 196, paragraphs 4 and 6). The identity of the material in the Bosc collection remains unknown. Dupuis does not discuss this point because there exists no information on it. But there is also no reason to believe that the Bosc material was different from the one in Fabricius' collection (see volume 23, page 196, paragraph 7). In the case of *crassipennis*, Fabricius likewise refers to Bosc, and in this case the specimens in Fabricius' own collection were obviously conspecific with, or even part of, the type series. The *Phasia* (*Ectophasia*) species are very rare or absent in the area of Kiel where Fabricius lived, and the origin of the specimens which he had in his collection under the names *crassipennis* and *subcoleoprata*, was most likely the Bosc collection because he refers only to this.

3. In his paragraph B 4 on page 139, Dupuis draws attention to the fact that Fabricius (1794) misidentified the unnamed picture of a *Phasia* (*Ectophasia*) *rubra* by Schaeffer (1767) as being his *Syrphus hemipterus* (*Alophora hemiptera* F.). This error of Fabricius is surprising because *A. hemiptera* is easily recognized by the long and dense red pilosity on the pleura, a character observed by Fabricius himself (see Dupuis p. 139, paragraph B 1). A picture giving only the dorsal aspect of the fly may, of course, not show this character clearly enough, and that seems to explain the error. When examining specimens of *rubra*, Fabricius should have noticed the absence of red pilosity and not have repeated the above mistake. Indeed, the specimens of *rubra* which, according to Meigen, were present in Fabricius' collection, were labelled *subcoleoprata* and not *hemiptera*.

4. In the footnote 6 on page 136, Dupuis cites an important text of Latreille (1809, p. 345) which I did not know. "*Conops subcoleopratus* Linnaei congener, sed a *T. subcoleoprata* Fabricii diversus videtur, ut indicant haec Linnaei verba: ..." This means that Latreille considered *Conops subcoleopratus* Linné as a species different from *Thereva subcoleoprata* Fabricius, and by designating the latter as type-species of *Phasia* intentionally excluded the Linnean species (which he did not know) from being the type. Latreille's opinion is based on the description of *subcoleoprata* by Linné and not on comparison of material. The only author who examined material of both species, the true *subcoleoprata* from Sweden and the so-called *subcoleoprata* of Fabricius, was Meigen, and his statement (1824, p. 186) is the only existing information on the identity of the type species of *Phasia*.

5. I agree with Dupuis as concerns the inconveniences of the name *rubra* Girschner (see pages 139-140, III A 1 and 3). The oldest name which undoubtedly applies to the species *Ectophasia rubra* Girschner of Dupuis, is *Phasia oblonga* Robineau-Desvoidy 1830, p. 291. The latter would be, on the basis of the available zoological facts, the valid name for the type-species of *Phasia*. The inconvenience remains that *P. oblonga* is an almost unknown name, and Dupuis is right when he says (p. 140,

III A 3), that from the viewpoint of usage, *P. crassipennis* F. would be preferable as type-species of *Phasia*. I accept this and change my proposal to the commission accordingly (see below). The generic concept of *Phasia* is not altered by this change.

6. I am surprised that Dupuis calls the usage of *Phasia*, as introduced by him in 1949 (in the sense of *Phorantha* Rond.), the "status quo" (p. 139, chapter III). When discussing the "usage routinier" of *Phasia* (p. 140, B 3, last paragraph) he avoids citing the specialists of the present century (Stein 1924, Baranov 1929, Villeneuve 1933, Mesnil 1939 and others) who have continued the established use of the generic name *Phasia* for *crassipennis* F. The reference to Villeneuve 1933 (cited by Dupuis in the preceding paragraph) concerns an erroneous use of the name *Ectophasia*. Villeneuve (l.c., page 197) describes two new species from China and defines the generic concept as follows: "Le genre *Ectophasia* Aldrich [sic] s'éloigne du genre *Phasia* Latr. par l'absence de dimorphisme sexuel". Villeneuve thus used the name *Ectophasia* for an asiatic species-group and conserved the name *Phasia* for *crassipennis* F.

7. In his chapter III C 1 on page 140, Dupuis shows that the change in the meaning of *Phasia*, as adopted by Dupuis and Sabrosky, necessitates a corresponding change on the suprageneric level. The established name *Phasiinae* should be replaced by *Ectophasiinae*, a name never used before. There is, thus, an "upsetting change in family-group names" (Sabrosky, volume 23, page 9, paragraph 2).

8. The facts concerning *Phasia* have now become rather clear and are to be summarized as follows: Latreille (1810) designated as type of *Phasia* the species *Thereva subcoleoprata* Fabricius, which he considered as specifically different from *Conops subcoleopratus* Linné. Meigen (1824) examined material of both Linné's and Fabricius' *subcoleoprata* and found them, in fact, belonging to different species-groups which were later raised to generic rank by Robineau-Desvoidy (1830). The material seen by Meigen in Fabricius' collection has not the status of a type in a strict sense because Fabricius, in his text, refers to the collection of Bosc. The Bosc material is lost (unless the material in Fabricius' collection is a part of it), but there is no indication that it was a species different from the one that was present in the collection of Fabricius.

Meigen identified the material of *Th. subcoleoprata* F. as a variety of *crassipennis* F. This determination was correct from the taxonomic viewpoint which was generally accepted in the period from Girschner (1888) till Dupuis (1949). The discovery of two valid species within the *crassipennis*-complex complicates the situation, because the material of *Th. subcoleoprata* in Fabricius' collection was probably not the true *crassipennis* F., but the other species, *rubra* Girschner of Dupuis, the valid name of which is *Phasia oblonga* R.D.

The use of the generic name *Phasia* was restricted to the *crassipennis*-complex by Robineau-Desvoidy (1830) and this usage has been followed without exception till 1910, and by many authors even till now. Coquillett (1910) and Dupuis (1949) have considered *hemiptera* F. or *subcoleoprata* Linné (nec Fabricius), respectively, as being the type-species of *Phasia* and have thus transferred the name to another genus, but this has not found general acceptance.

In agreement with Dupuis' paragraph III A 3 (page 140) I change my original proposal¹ as follows: In order to avoid confusion and to maintain stability of nomenclature, it is requested that the International Commission should take the following action:

- (1) use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type-species for *Phasia* Latreille 1804, made prior to the ruling now requested, and having done so designate *Syrphus crassipennis* Fabricius, 1794 (included into the genus *Phasia* under the same species name by Latreille) to be the type-species of that genus;

¹ The paragraph concerning the proposed action of the Commission, as included in my first paper (volume 22, page 245) and repeated with some changes here, was formulated by the Editor. This help is gratefully acknowledged. There was a slight mistake concerning *rubra* Girschner in this paragraph (see Dupuis, page 134, footnote 1, and page 139, paragraph III A 1), for which I am not responsible.

- (2) place the generic name *Phasia* Latreille, 1804 (gender: feminine) type-species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Syrphus crassipennis* Fabricius, 1794, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (3) place the species name *crassipennis* Fabricius, 1794 (*Entomologia systematica*, vol. 4, p. 284) as published in the binomen *Syrphus crassipennis* (type-species of *Phasia* Latreille, 1804) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

- BARANOFF, N. 1929. Studien an pathogenen und parasitischen Insekten. II: Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Phasiinen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gruppe Ocyptera. *Inst. Hyg. Schule Volksgesundh. Zagreb, Arb. parasitol.* Abt. Nr. 2 : 1-22
- MESNIL, L. P. 1939. Essai sur les Tachinaires. *Monogr. Sta. Lab. Rech. agron. Paris*, 67 pp.
- ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, J. B. 1830. Essai sur les Myodaires. *Mém. Acad. Sci., Paris*, 2 : 1-814
- STEIN, P. 1824. Die verbreitetsten Tachiniden Mitteleuropas nach ihren Gattungen und Arten. *Arch. Naturgesch.* 90 A (6) : 1-272
- VILLENEUVE, J. 1933. Myodaires supérieurs asiatiques nouveaux. *Bull. Ann. Soc. ent. Belg.* 73 : 195-199.